

1
2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Tillman Robinson,

No. CV-23-00443-PHX-SMM (CDB)

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER

11 v.

12 Beyond Food LLC, et al.,

13 Defendants.

14
15 This matter was assigned to Magistrate Judge Camille D. Bibles. (Doc. 5). On
16 January 17, 2024, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation with this
17 Court.¹ (Doc. 21). The Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for
18 Attorney Fees, (Doc. 20), be granted in-part. To date, no objections have been filed.

19
20 ¹ This case is assigned to a Magistrate Judge. However, not all parties have
21 consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge. Thus, the matter is before this Court
pursuant to General Order 21-25, which states in relevant part:

22 When a United States Magistrate Judge to whom a civil action has been
23 assigned pursuant to Local Rule 3.7(a)(1) considers dismissal to be
24 appropriate but lacks the jurisdiction to do so under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1)
due to incomplete status of election by the parties to consent or not consent
to the full authority of the Magistrate Judge,

25 **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge will prepare a Report and
Recommendation for the Chief United States District Judge or designee.

26 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** designating the following District Court
27 Judges to review and, if deemed suitable, to sign the order of dismissal on
my behalf:

28 Phoenix/Prescott: Senior United States District Judge Stephen M.
McNamee

STANDARD OF REVIEW

2 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
3 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see Baxter v.
4 Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991). Parties have fourteen days from the
5 service of a copy of the Magistrate’s recommendation within which to file specific
6 written objections to the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72. Failure to
7 object to a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation relieves the Court of conducting *de novo*
8 review of the Magistrate Judge’s factual findings and waives all objections to those
9 findings on appeal. See Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998). A failure to
10 object to a Magistrate Judge’s conclusion “is a factor to be weighed in considering the
11 propriety of finding waiver of an issue on appeal.” Id.

DISCUSSION

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and no Objections having been made by any party thereto, the Court hereby incorporates and adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

17 || Accordingly, for the reasons set forth,

18 **IT IS ORDERED** adopting the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate
19 Judge. (Doc. 21).

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** granting in-part Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney
21 Fees. (Doc. 20).

22 || **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff be awarded:

1. Attorney fees in the amount of \$4,800.00;
2. Taxable costs in the amount of \$478.40;
3. Collection costs in the amount of \$1,000.00.

Dated this 2nd day of February, 2024.

Stephen. McNamee

Honorable Stephen M. McNamee
Senior United States District Judge